

Miri AF

Massive missives and more

Miri AF

Massive missives and more

[HELP MIRI](#)

King Charles Does Not Have Cancer

0
SHARES



Written by: Miri | February 6, 2024 | No Comments

In the phenomenally successful television sitcom, '*Friends*', we often saw the three female characters - despite the actresses who played them being rail thin and famed for their strict diet and exercise regimes - feasting on pizza, ice cream, and sugary cocktails.

Why did *'Friends'* show us this? Not because the women were really eating these foods (the 'ice cream' containers would be empty; the 'cocktails' coloured water, etc.). The point was to model it for you: to show *you* that eating junk is normal and acceptable and what 'friends' do.

That is the point of all sitcoms and soap operas, which are all powerfully effective programming mechanisms for social sculpting and social change. When the ruling classes want to introduce certain social changes, or normalise certain behaviours, they introduce them through the medium of the flickering screen, knowing that at the base, most instinctive level, "[monkey see, monkey do](#)" is still how human psychology works.

When we see people we perceive as being in some way important - sitcom stars on a screen or other "beloved" celebrities - behaving in a certain way, we internalise it as normal, desirable, and aspirational, and we accept it, generally through mimicking and copying. Jennifer Aniston gets 'the Rachel' haircut, millions of women rush out to do the same. Courtney Cox wears a certain dress to a premiere, it sells out the next day. That's why celluloid stars get paid such an extraordinary amount of money - because of the phenomenal power they wield to shape human behaviour.

And so it is too on the world stage, with the perennial star-studded soap opera of The Royal Family.

THE KING HAS CANCER, screamed all the headlines yesterday.

This follows the news of his allegedly having been admitted to hospital to treat an enlarged prostate, at the same time daughter-in-law Kate was hospitalised for a "mystery abdominal procedure". As soon as these stories started to saturate the press, the stench of psy-op was unmistakable, and as I said [in January](#) (in response to Liz Jones' [breathtakingly sycophantic declaration](#) that "*the news of Kate's hospitalisation has hit me like a young member of my own family has been struck down*"):

"That this story is suddenly headline news everywhere, and getting nauseatingly simpering coverage like this, is enough in itself to raise alarm bells, but it's even more suspicious when one considers the Royals are notoriously private about their health. If there was genuinely something wrong with two key, high-profile Royals at the same time, one being the Monarch, there is no way the press would be given a green light to report on it like this. It would all be hushed up to preserve public confidence in the "Royal" institution and the monarch's ability to reign etc.

This to me looks like a cover story to justify why Kate and Charles won't be seen in public for a while (apparently Kate hasn't been seen for nearly a month) and the real

reasons for this have nothing to do with them "being ill". Connected to swirling rumours about Charles' abdication perhaps?"

So, that was the first clear indication that this event was being staged. Anybody with a passing familiarity with Royal protocol will be able to confirm what I said above: if high-profile members of the Royal dynasty are battling serious health problems, the press is not informed. It's hushed up, and there are innumerable examples of this throughout Royal history, e.g., the [Queen's disabled cousins](#), Katherine and Nerissa Bowes-Lyon.

Born with severe learning difficulties, they were, as young women in the 1940s, carted off to an institution, and completely excised from Royal life - indeed, a 1963 edition of Burke's Peerage (a reference book to the nation's aristocracy) said they had died, when they were both in fact still very much alive.

Nerissa died aged 66 in 1986 and was buried in a grave marked only with a name tag and serial number. Katherine stayed in the same institution until 1997, when it closed amid abuse claims, and then lived in another home in Surrey. She later died aged 87 in 2014.

Why were these women erased from the Royal landscape so brutally? Because *"there were fears that the sister's condition could threaten the social standing of the royal family"*.

Ditto the famous case of "the lost prince", Prince John, the youngest child of George V (Queen Elizabeth's grandfather). John developed a severe form of epilepsy in early childhood, as well as displaying developmental delay and learning difficulties (modern diagnostics would probably have found him autistic).

He was swiftly removed from the public eye and sent to live with his "nanny" in a cottage, rarely seeing his parents or siblings, who were embarrassed by him. He died from a severe epileptic fit aged 13.

Prince John's eldest brother, the future Edward VII, [viewed his death](#) as *"little more than a regrettable nuisance"*. Writing to his mistress of the time, he stated, *"the poor boy had become more of an animal than anything else."*

It was only after Prince John's death that the public was informed of his illness.

These examples provide very clear context and historical record as to how the Royal Family views and treats its members with serious health problems. The Royal Family has a PR front to maintain and would not disclose serious illness in such a

sensationalist, soap-opera style as has characterised Charles and Kate's "mystery ailments".

Have you noticed that element, the "mystery" bit? We're being told Kate was admitted to hospital for a procedure serious enough to warrant two weeks' stay... but we're not allowed to know what it is.

Charles has cancer (sorry, HAS CANCER!!!), but we're not allowed to know what kind of cancer.

Yet...

This is all absolutely text-book soap-opera scripting - building tension, creating suspense, getting us on the edge of our seats waiting for the next scandalous revelation to break...

And it's all completely made up, just like it is in soap operas. When we saw Chandler Bing and Monica Geller "struggle with infertility" in 'Friends', this isn't because the actors who played them were really having these struggles: they were modelling it (normalising it) for you (fertility rates having nosedived since the early 2000s when 'Friends' last aired).

Equally, King Charles is modelling "having cancer", which, it has recently been revealed, his former sister-in-law Sarah Ferguson has too - for the [second time](#) in months - whilst Queen-in-waiting Kate has a "mystery illness".

So what's being modelled (normalised) for you here?

That multiple members of your family getting struck down by cancer and other serious conditions at the same time, is normal.

Just as is happening up and down the country and around the world. Previously healthy, relatively young people are suddenly developing aggressive, terminal cancers out of nowhere, and then, just months later, close relatives are dropping dead, too.

It's happened in my own family. I have relatives in Australia, including a previously fit and active couple in their early seventies.

In 2022, out of nowhere, the wife was diagnosed with aggressive stage 4 lung cancer. She had never smoked. Four months later, she was dead.

Less than a year later, neighbours noticed newspapers piling up outside the house where her husband still lived and where he had been seen just days before walking the dog. He was found dead in bed from a cardiac event.

Almost everyone has stories like this now, and it's not "normal". Severe illness and death don't usually - or haven't historically - happened so closely together. Usually, couples' deaths are separated by years or decades (my paternal grandmother outlived my grandfather by 36 years, and my maternal grandfather died in 2004, whilst my grandmother is still going strong 20 years later). Now, increasingly, it is months or even weeks.

This is a drastic, extraordinary change, so the sensational soap opera of the century - The Royal Family (which has literally been made into a gripping soap opera on Netflix) - is making it normal. That's what's really happening here.

Charles doesn't "have cancer", he's acting ("all the world's a stage", remember?), and there's nothing wrong with Kate or Fergie, either.

These people have access to real, clean food and proper, effective medicine, of the type that is kept entirely out of reach of the masses, and so, in the unlikely event they got cancer in the first place, would know how to treat it in a way that works, which is not cut-poison-burn chemotherapy and its [stratospherically high kill rate](#).

The Royal Family are [famous for using homeopathy](#), because that and other forms of "alternative" medicine are real human medicine: allopathy ("Western medicine"), on the other hand, was [developed by the ruling classes as population control](#) for the masses. They don't use it on themselves.

But now the Royals are pretending to "have cancer" and receive conventional treatment for it.

Why?

So that now, when your not-that-old dad and fit and sporty niece and jolly sister-in-law, all suddenly get diagnosed with serious conditions at the same time, you won't be tempted to ask, "hang on, what's going on here, why are my previously healthy family members all suddenly getting ill at once?". Rather, you will think, "ooh, well, that's how it is now, just like it happened to the Royals. Anybody could be struck down at any time for no reason..." (just as the [predictive programming press says](#)).

It's the same modelling that actor Alexander "Boris" Johnson did with pretending to "nearly die from Covid". That was all faked and staged and no serious person thinks anything any different at this point. Why would someone who had "nearly died of Covid", just weeks later, attend mass gatherings that ["broke all the rules"](#) and risked "reinfecting" him? Obviously he wouldn't, because obviously there was no near-death experience - and indeed no Covid - but rather, the point of his performance was to shape expectations and model desirable behaviour for the masses.

"Oh My God, even the Prime Minister isn't safe from this terrible plague! Better quit my job, lock myself in my house, and avoid all contact with family and friends indefinitely!"

Back then, the ruling classes wanted to normalise an epidemic of "Covid". Now, they want to normalise an epidemic of cancer. But for that, we need a bigger name than a flash-in-the-pan politician. For the scariest disease of all, we need the biggest name of all... The King of England, no less!

Many have observed it's quite the "coincidence" that the news of Charles' cancer breaks one day after it is announced [a new mRNA jab](#) for the condition is being trialled, and speculated he may be treated with this wonder drug and make a miraculous recovery.

It's certainly possible, but I suspect unlikely, because this drug has been overtly confirmed as "experimental" and still in trials. And one certainly does not experiment on The King! (What are the plebs for, after all, if not [unethical medical experimentation](#)?)

I think the magnitude of this psy-op is much more significant than simply serving as an advertorial for a new drug. That could be it in part: but it would likely pack a weightier punch if Charles actually "died from cancer" before the mRNA jab had completed trials, and then we could have lots of over-the-top weepy and hysterical editorials (Liz Jones, where are you?), lamenting *"if only this amazing new treatment had been ready in time, he could have been saved! But although The King missed out on this miraculous medicine, it's not too late for you! Get your magical mRNA today and outlive The King!"* (Sponsored by Pfizer.)

So that could be part of it. But for such a seminal world-stage production, we've got to think bigger.

We know it is an agenda item to dismantle the Royal Family, because monarchies have always stood in the way of governments generally and One World Governments in particular. For the ruling classes' "dream" of a borderless world with no countries (or religions or possessions as Klaus Schwab and John Lennon have told us), we can't have monarchies, and the only one in the world that is any longer of any interest to anybody is the English one, so they have to go.

Note that Nostradamus "[predicted](#)" Charles' early abdication, and by 'predicted', read 'scripted'. The reason various "prophecies" appear to keep coming true is that the same family bloodlines have been in charge for a very long time, and so they simply script an event, then later make it happen, and claim a "prophecy" has been fulfilled. It's just the same as [The Simpsons](#) and other prominent cultural totems like [Back To](#)

[The Future](#) "predicting" 9/11. It's not predicted, it's scripted - because these people are all acting.

They see themselves as 'Gods', and use their fulfilled "prophecies" as "proof" of their divine status - but really, they are just black magic conjurors, using deceitful parlour tricks and the power of illusion to manipulate us. Things happen that they "predict" because they make them happen, and so it will be for Nostradamus' "prediction" about Charles' abdication, and the chaos - potentially leading to the end of the monarchy - that will inevitably follow.

Note that we are currently on the cusp of a new Labour government - indeed, a Labour landslide to rival 1997's - when the next General Election is called (so I am reliably informed) in May.

You can't scrap the Royal Family under a Tory government, too many staunch monarchists in the Conservative Party - but you certainly could under a Labour one, and Keir Starmer is on record as having previously called for the [abolition of the monarchy](#).

If Charles abdicates or dies because of his "cancer", that will weaken already shaky confidence in the Royal Family yet further. The Queen's death and Prince Andrew's seedy shenanigans have already seen their approval ratings plummet, and another blow such as an unexpected abdication could effectively finish them off - especially if William is unable or unwilling to step up to his Kingly duties effectively (perhaps because of a severely ill or dead wife? Well, and there's also that persistent rumour on the edge of the conspiraverse that [he's actually the Anti-Christ](#), so I guess there's that...).

Starmer could then officially call for the end of the monarchy, and frame it as a tremendous "victory for the people", just as was depicted in the brilliantly observed satire '[The Queen and I](#)' (Sue Townsend's novel about a socialist government overthrowing the monarchy and sending the Royals to live on a council estate).

It's also most noteworthy to remember what Charles' other daughter-in-law, Meghan Markle, does for a living.

She's a very accomplished Hollywood actress.

I said from the start that her "marriage" to Harry was just another acting role... and why would they need a seasoned, professional actress in such a high-profile role in the Royal Family?

To stage an explosively convincing "season finale" as the monarchy implodes, perhaps?

As [I concluded back in 2020](#) when commenting on 'The Harry and Meghan Show' (season one, spoiler alerts!):

"What's going on currently is just another episode in the soap opera of The Royal Family (which is, admittedly, not as entertaining as the Caroline Aherne version). The Royals have some endgame in mind which Meghan, via her acting talents, is helping them achieve. She really is quite an accomplished actress, you know - and has played several roles in the past where her [character's name is 'Meghan.'](#) All the world's a stage... Especially when it involves actual, literal, actors!"

Thanks for reading! This site is entirely reader-powered, with no paywalls, adverts, or wealthy corporate backers, making it truly independent. Your support is therefore crucial to ensuring this site's continued existence. If you'd like to make a contribution to help this site keep going, please consider...

1. *Subscribing monthly [via Patreon](#) or [Substack](#)*
2. *Making a one-off contribution [via BuyMeACoffee](#)*
3. *Contributing in either way via bank transfer to Nat West account number 30835984, sort code 54-10-27, account name FINCH MA*

Your support is what allows this site to continue to exist and is enormously appreciated. Thank you.

Find Miri AF on social media via the links below...

[Substack](#), [Facebook](#), [Instagram](#), [YouTube](#) and [Twitter](#) (posting there as my other resource, [Informed Consent Matters](#))

Search

Search

Archives

▼

Categories

▼

Recent Posts

- [King Charles Does Not Have Cancer](#)
- [Nobody wants to find a dead cat](#)
- [Gillick Competency and Implied Consent](#)

Please subscribe to receive the latest blog posts and updates:

All Rights Reserved.



Subscribe

[wpdon id=278]

 **BECOME A PATRON**